# UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL on MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION



IN RE: DAVOL, INC./C.R. BARD, INC., POLYPROPYLENE HERNIA MESH PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

MDL No. 2846

#### TRANSFER ORDER

**Before the Panel:**\* Plaintiffs in fifteen of the actions listed on Schedule A pending in seven districts move under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 to centralize pretrial proceedings in this litigation in the Southern District of Ohio or, alternatively, the Western District of Missouri. Plaintiffs in more than 30 actions support centralization in one or both of these districts. Plaintiffs' motion involves 53 actions pending in 21 districts, as listed on Schedule A.¹ The Panel also has been notified of 69 potentially-related actions ("potential tag-along actions") pending in 27 districts.²

Movants take the position that the MDL should not include cases involving the Bard Composix Kugel Hernia Patch ("CK Patch"). Defendants C.R. Bard, Inc. and Davol Inc. do not oppose centralization of litigation involving their polypropylene hernia repair products, but only if all such products (including the CK Patch) are included in centralized proceedings. Defendants suggest the District of New Jersey or the Southern District of New York or, alternatively, the Eastern District of New York, the District of Rhode Island, or the Eastern District of Louisiana as transferee district. Plaintiff in one potential tag-along action opposes inclusion of the CK Patch cases.<sup>3</sup> In reply, movants argue that the transferee court should determine whether the MDL should include CK Patch cases.

On the basis of the papers filed and hearing session held, we find that these actions involve common questions of fact, and that centralization in the Southern District of Ohio will serve the convenience of the parties and witnesses and promote the just and efficient conduct of this litigation. All of the actions share common factual questions arising out of allegations that defects in

<sup>\*</sup> Judge Lewis A. Kaplan and Judge Ellen Segal Huvelle took no part in the decision of this matter.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Two additional actions included in the motion for centralization have been dismissed.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Panel Rules 1.1(h), 7.1, and 7.2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Plaintiffs in two additional potential tag-along actions initially opposed inclusion of the CK Patch cases but withdrew their opposition and now support centralization of all actions in the Southern District of Ohio.

defendants' polypropylene hernia mesh products can lead to complications when implanted in patients, including adhesions, damage to organs, inflammatory and allergic responses, foreign body rejection, migration of the mesh, and infections. Centralization will eliminate duplicative discovery; prevent inconsistent pretrial rulings; and conserve the resources of the parties, their counsel, and the judiciary.

Whether to include the CK Patch cases in centralized proceedings is a question not currently before the Panel, as none of the cases on the motion involve the CK Patch. We will address this question in due course through the conditional transfer order process.

We find that the Southern District of Ohio is an appropriate transferee district. It is centrally located geographically, making it a convenient forum for this nationwide litigation. Eight actions are pending in this district, six of them before Judge Edmund A. Sargus, an experienced transferee judge who will steer these cases on a prudent course.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the actions listed on Schedule A and pending outside the Southern District of Ohio are transferred to Southern District of Ohio and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Edmund A. Sargus for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings.

#### PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

I certify that this is a true and correct copy of the original filed in my office on 8/6/2018

Richard W. Nagel, Clerk

By: 8/6/2018

Date: 8/6/2018

Sarah S. Vance Chair

Marjorie O. Rendell Charles R. Breyer R. David Proctor Catherine D. Perry

#### **SCHEDULE A**

#### District of Arizona

BOURLOKAS v. DAVOL INCORPORATED, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-00615

#### Eastern District of California

SILBER, ET AL. v. DAVOL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:18-00479 GRESCHNER v. CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS & REHABILITATION, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:15-01663 HANSEN v. DAVOL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-00495

# Southern District of Florida

DAWSON-WEBB v. DAVOL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 0:17-62012 BARBAREE v. DAVOL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 9:18-80243

#### Central District of Illinois

MCGINNIS v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:16-01255

## Northern District of Illinois

COLEMAN v. DAVOL, INC., C.A. No. 1:18-01706

#### Eastern District of Kentucky

MOORE v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 0:17-00132

#### Western District of Kentucky

WHITEHOUSE v. DAVOL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 3:18-00020

# Eastern District of Louisiana

STIPELCOVICH v. C.R. BARD, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:17-09656 MCMANUS v. C.R. BARD, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:17-11836 BAPTIST v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:17-12718 ROBERTS, SR., ET AL. v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:17-13657

#### MDL No. 2846 Schedule A (Continued)

# Eastern District of Louisiana (Cont.)

SANDERS, ET AL. v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-02884

#### Southern District of Mississippi

DOVE v. DAVOL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 3:18-00003

#### Eastern District of Missouri

GREENWOOD v. DAVOL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:17-00039 BROYLES v. DAVOL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 4:18-00513

#### Western District of Missouri

COUSSAS v. DAVOL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-04015
POWELL v. DAVOL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 3:18-05019
LYON v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 4:18-00039
ELI v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 4:18-00116
ELLIOT v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 4:18-00125
HEILI v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 4:18-00130
MANUEL v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 4:18-00131
POWELL v. DAVOL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 4:18-00156
SCHAPELER v. DAVOL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 4:18-00169
CHRISSAN v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 6:18-03019
LEE v. C.R. BARD, ET AL., C.A. No. 6:18-03075

## District of New Jersey

OGLE v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-00819
BURGESS v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-01390
SPENCER v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-01692
GALLOW v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-02533
VOLPE v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-02602
ZEMKO v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-02742
NEWLAND, ET AL. v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-02915

#### MDL No. 2846 Schedule A (Continued)

# District of New Mexico

NANCE v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:18-00003

Eastern District of New York

FURLEITER v. DAVOL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-01229

Northern District of Ohio

KNAUSS, ET AL. v. DAVOL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 3:18-00316

#### Southern District of Ohio

LANE v. DAVOL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-00164 CURREY v. DAVOL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-00222 ABSHIRE, ET AL. v. DAVOL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-00268

#### Eastern District of Pennsylvania

WROTEN, ET AL. v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:17-04546 GORDON v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:17-04553

#### District of South Carolina

BROWN v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-00580 CAMPBELL, ET AL. v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-00581 ADAMS v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-00582 BRUGGER, ET AL. v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 3:17-00228

#### Middle District of Tennessee

TERRELL v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 3:17-01575

# Eastern District of Texas

WILLIAMS v. DAVOL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:18-00151

# MDL No. 2846 Schedule A (Continued)

# Southern District of Texas

BECERRA v. C.R. BARD, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 1:18-00023

Southern District of Texas (Cont.)

WADE v. DAVOL, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 4:18-01112